

REMARKS

This response adds new claims 11-14. Support for new claim 11 can be found at page 5, line 25 to page 6, line 1. Support for new claims 12-13 can be found at page 6, lines 19-24. Support for new claim 14 can be found at page 7, lines 6-8. Upon amendment, this application has three independent claims (claims 1, 5, and 10) and 14 total claims (claims 1-14). Thus, no fee for excess claims is necessary.

In sections 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 10 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakanishi et al. (US Patent No. 6,337,953). Moreover, claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Nakanishi does not disclose, teach, or suggest, *inter alia*, the following features recited by the claimed invention:

claim 1: "two fixed members integrally formed on the bracket".

claim 5: "a fixed member integrally formed on the bracket".

claim 10: "a bracket, having two holders, disposed inside the camera" and "a flash emission tube fixedly disposed inside the bracket by the holders."

Nakanishi discloses a strobe device with reduced size. In the strobe device, the connecting conductor has a contact with the light emitting tube and electricity is supplied to the light emitting tube through the connecting

conductor. However, Nakanishi fails to teach that the fixed member(s) are **integrally** formed on the bracket. Instead, the comb-like holder portions 462 are **detachably** connected to the transmission plate 461.

The main objective of the present application is to provide a flash unit with reduced production costs and assembly time (see e.g. page 3, lines 4-6) by **simplifying** the structure of the fix members and the assembly procedure of installing the flash emssion tube inside the bracket. The strobe device disclosed in Nakanishi (see e.g. Fig. 4) is actually much **more complicated** than the admitted prior art as described at pages 1-2 of the specification. Presumably, the production costs and assembly time of the strobe device in Nakanishi are more than those of the admitted prior art. Thus, Nakanishi **cannot achieve the intended purpose** of the present application. Instead, Nakanishi **teaches away** from the present application by teaching a more complicated structure with increased assembly time.

MPEP 2131 states that a "claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference," quoting *Verdegaal Bros v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Under MPEP 2143, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Since the Examiner does not show that Nakanishi teaches the elements as quoted above, the Applicants believe that claims 1, 5 and 10 are patentable. Claims 2-4, 6-9 and 11-14 are also patentable, at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 1, 5 or 10. Moreover, these claims are patentable by virtue of the additional limitations recited therein.

For example, claim 11 recites, in part, "wherein the flash emission tube is installed by bending the fixed members and fixed on the bracket by the elastic force of the fixed members." Claim 12 recites, in part, "wherein the flash emission tube is installed by bending the fixed member and fixed on the bracket by the elastic force of the fixed member." Claim 13 recites, in part, "wherein one end of the flash emission tube is received inside the receiving portion, and the other end of the flash emission tube is fixed on the bracket by the fixed member." Claim 14 recites, in part, "wherein the flash emission tube is mounted inside the bracket by clamping of the holders." The Applicants believe that these features are not disclosed or suggested in Nakanishi.

The Applicants believe that all claims are now in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account No. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

Enclosed please find a copy of Troy Guangyu Cai's Notice of Limited Recognition under 35 CFR 10.9(b) to prepare and prosecute patent

Examiner Laura K. Tso
Response

Page 6

Art Unit 2875
USSN 10/052,728

applications wherein the patent applicant is a client of Ladas & Parry, and the attorney of record in the applications is a registered practitioner who is a member of Ladas & Parry.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

May 2, 2003

(Date of Deposit)

Troy Guangyu Cai

(Name of Person Signing)



(Signature)

5/21/2003

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Troy Guangyu Cai
Attorney for Applicant
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
(323) 934-2300




BEFORE THE OFFICE OF ENROLLMENT AND DISCIPLINE
UNITED STATE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIMITED RECOGNITION UNDER 37 CFR § 10.9(b)

Guangyu Cai is hereby given limited recognition under 37 CFR § 10.9(b) as an employee of Ladas & Parry to prepare and prosecute patent applications wherein the patent applicant is a client of Ladas & Parry, and the attorney or agent of record in the applications is a registered practitioner who is a member of Ladas & Parry. This limited recognition shall expire on the date appearing below, or when whichever of the following events first occurs prior to the date appearing below: (i) Guangyu Cai ceases to lawfully reside in the United States, (ii) Guangyu Cai's employment with Ladas & Parry ceases or is terminated, or (iii) Guangyu Cai ceases to remain or reside in the United States on an H-1 visa.

This document constitutes proof of such recognition. The original of this document is on file in the Office of Enrollment and Discipline of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Expires: November 19, 2003



Harry I. Moatz
Director of Enrollment and Discipline